THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

February 21, 1986

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of January 15, 1986 minutes

B. Dates of next meetings:

13 March, 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

17 April, 1986, 10:00 AM (Thursday)

C. Confirmation of Appointment of Peter Vercelli to a second term on the Commission's Georgetown Board

D. Memo on Sculpture Panels for FBI Building: Frederick Hart

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 21/FEB/86-1, Washington Monument Visitors Facility, concept design.

B. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 21/FEB/86-2, Union Station, First Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N. E., renovation briefing, (previous review, March 1985).

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 21/FEB/86-3, Chancery of Canada, final building plans, 501 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. (S.L. 86-65)

2. CFA 21/FEB/86-5, Willard Hotel, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., canopy mock-up inspection report, (previous review, January, 1986).

3. CFA 21/FEB/86-7, Evening Star Building, 11th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., renovation and addition, concept design.

4. CFA 21/FEB/86-8, Washington Hotel, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., sidewalk cafe design.

D. Department of Army, Corps of Engineers

CFA 21/FEB/86-4, Arlington Cemetery, Visitors Center Parking Garage, revised concept design, and inspection report, (previous review, January, 1986).

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-76, 3300 M Street, N. W., new office/retail building, (previous, November 13, 1985, O.G. 85-280).

b. O.G. 86-70-71, 1625 and 1627 - 34th Street, N. W., renovation and additions, (two houses).

c. O.G. 86-47, 1222 - 28th Street, N. W., one story rear addition, (previous case, O.G. 85-100).

d. Appendix I. Review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations.

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-67, 702-720 Fifth Street, N. W., new building for Group Health Association, concept design.

Shipstead-Luce Act (continued)

b. S.L. 86-72, 3007 Oregon Knolls Drive, N. W., new house.

c. S.L. 86-76, 441 - 4th Street, N. W., revised concept designs for new office building, (previous review, January 1986, S.L. 86-60).

d. S.L. 86-75, 698 Water Street, S. W., new restaurant building, Southwest Waterfront, final plans, (previous review, September 1982).

e. S.L. 86-62, 2121 Park Road, N. W., new indoor swimming pool, concept design.

f. Appendix II. Review of Staff recommendations.

F. National Academy of Sciences

CFA 21/FEB/86-9, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W., final plans for walkway to Einstein Memorial Statue area, (previous review, October 1985).

G. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

CFA 21/FEB/86-10, Army Civilian Award for Humanitarian Service, design.

H. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 21/FEB/86-6, Lady Bird Johnson Medal, resubmission of obverse, (previous review, December, 1985).

REPORT OF ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-22 (See O.G. 85-92)	3800 Reservoir Road Georgetown University	New medical center

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the proposed new medical building as shown on drawings received and dated 6 February 1986. Working drawings conform to approved concept design. No objection to choice of exterior brick as it matches the existing building to the north, (Beldeu Brick 470-479A).

O.G. 86-50	1267-1271 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. The Gap	Renovation: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design as shown on concept supplemental drawings received and dated 23 January 1986 provided that north bay window be treated to match projecting bays facing Wisconsin Avenue.

O.G. 86-53	3415 M Street, N. W. John Snyder, Jr.	Sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for painted lettering on existing wood sign panel only. Proposed additional lettering on a plastic background mounted over existing window glass is not acceptable.

O.G. 86-54	1430 33rd Street, N. W. Mrs. Alexander Graham	Replace windows

ACTION: Do not recommend issuance of permit. Existing varied window types are original and in character with the history of the house and the historic district. Replacing all the windows with a uniform thermopane unit having false muntins is inappropriate to the character of the house and the historic district. Replacing wood operable shutters (blinds) is not recommended. See U. S. Department of Interior, Technical Preservation Services Division, Preservation Briefs: 9; The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-57 (See O.G. 86-9)	1313 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Gussini Shoes, Inc.	Storefront renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for renovation shown on drawings received and dated 24 January 1986. Design submitted conforms to approved concept.

O.G. 86-58	1516 34th Street, N. W. John Richardson - N. Leake	Rear addition and sideyard gate: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design concept provided that proposed new entrance gate is intended only to screen existing curb cut and parking pad. As such, recommend gate consist of wood piers and solid wood panels with placement set back (with a reveal) from face of house. In addition, recommend careful re-study and simplification of pier caps. Other areas of study should include the height of the proposed chimney (which may not be sufficient for proper draft) and elimination of the window or recessed brick panel facing the street.

O.G. 86-59	1627 34th Street, N. W. 34th Street Association	Side and rear additions and renovations: Conceptual

ACTION: Submission superseded by O.G. 86-71.

O.G. 86-60	1625 34th Street, N. W. 34th Street Association	Side and rear additions and renovations: Conceptual

ACTION: Submission superseded by O.G. 86-70.

O.G. 86-61	1336 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Mrs. Field's Cookies	Awning-sign

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for an awning-sign as shown on drawing received and dated 24 January 1986.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-64	1515 30th Street, N. W. Mrs. Jean Partridge	Air conditioning unit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the relocation of the rooftop air conditioning unit. Recommend erection of a sound shield or buffer screen to minimize noise for adjacent apartment dwellers.

O.G. 86-65	1254 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. John Snyder	Exhaust duct

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. Concept of breaking through and running up outer masonry wall of historic structure to run exhaust duct up to roof is not appropriate to the preservation of the historic district.

O.G. 86-66 (See O.G. 86-19)	3050 P Street, N. W. Livingston Biddle	Renovation of existing townhouse: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the concept design for the proposed rear alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 6 February 1986. However, concept design for new front stoop is not approved. Recommend that existing stoop be renovated.

O.G. 86-68 (See O.G. 86-15)	1024 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz Companies	New building

ACTION: Submission received on information basis only. Recommendations or actions will be withheld pending District Government decision on issue of demolition of existing structure. Recommend submission of new case upon resolution of this matter.

O.G. 86-69	3043 P Street, N. W. J. K. Figge	Addition of dormers to existing residence: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the concept or general form of the proposed dormer windows. Recommend simplification of design by removing pilaster caps and "thinning" vertical elements.

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF UNDER SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-66	412 South Capitol Street, S. E. Dyanne and Robert Branand	House renovation

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for house renovation. Proposed exterior changes will be minor and confined to rear of existing residence.

S.L. 86-68	1700 H Street, N. W. Metropolitan Club	Addition: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the concept of the proposed addition to the Metropolitan Club. Addition as shown in drawings received and dated 7 February 1986 will be set back from existing facade of two story west wing and have minimal impact on public view. Recommend refinement of details and submission of working drawings and material samples for review by Commission when ready.

S.L. 86-69	1920 G Street, N. W. United Church	Renovation

ACTION: Submission returned without comment as property is outside Shipstead-Luce Act boundaries.

S.L. 86-70	201 Massachusetts Avenue, N. E. 333 2nd Street, N. E.	Alterations, repair and awning: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the concept of renovation and alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 7 February 1986. Recommend final submission include sample of "Dryvit" veneer intended for exterior rustication. Further recommend that proposed awnings be submitted as a separate case, said case to include material and lettering samples.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-71	2908 Cortland Place, N. W. Richard K. Jung and Janice K. Anderson	Dormer alteration

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for connecting the two existing dormers with the addition of a third window as in-fill. However, recommend that roof be standing seam metal as now exists for proper run-off and that facing wall panels be slate rather than painted wood for greater compatibility. Note changes to submitted drawing.

S.L. 86-73 (See S.L. 86-01)	500 H Street, N. W. Jud. Sq. Dev. Gp. Ltd. Partnership	New hotel

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the revision to permit number B-310332. Revision entails replacing caststone arches with head and stretcher brick arches and removing the vertical muntins from the typical guest room windows.

S.L. 86-74	4 F Street, N. W. Daniel Coleman	Sidewalk cafe and new windows

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the proposed sidewalk cafe and new double-glazed wood windows with stained glass transom lights as shown in drawings received and dated 13 February 1986. Approval is given with understanding that sidewalk cafe will not be enclosed.

S.L. 86-77 (See S.L. 86-14)	51 Louisiana Avenue, N. W. Acacia Life	New entrance

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the revision to permit number B-311962. Revision entails modification of proposed secondary entrance stair.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202–566–1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 February 1986

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Roy M. Goodman Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Pascal Regan Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Robert Cousins

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of the meeting of 15 January 1986. Approved.

B. Dates of next meetings. Approved as: 13 March 1986 (Thursday), 17 April 1986 (Thursday).

C. Confirmation of Appointment of Peter Vercelli to a second term on the Commission's Georgetown Board. The Secretary noted that the members had been polled by mail before the meeting and this was a confirmation for the record. He said the staff was pleased that Mr. Vercelli would continue to serve on the Georgetown Board.

D. Memo on Sculpture panels for the FBI Building: Frederick Hart. Mr. Hart said that in response to the Constitution Bicentennial Committee's request for suggestions for the 1987 celebration, he would

like to propose that relief sculpture, with a Constitutional theme, be placed in the panels on the Pennsylvania Avenue frontage of the FBI Building. The Chairman thought this would be an excellent opportunity to improve the appearance of the building and celebrate the Constitution; the other members agreed, and it was directed that the proposal be transmitted to Chief Justice Burger, Chairman of the Bicentennial Committee, and to the Attorney General.

Exhibits A through A-4

E. Techworld Resolution (this item was not on the printed agenda). Mr. Hart read a resolution restating the Commission's disapproval, in October 1985, of the Techworld project. He said he hoped the new members would confirm this previous action and by this resolution notify the city government that the Commission continued to oppose the project. The members were in unanimous agreement that the resolution should be forwarded, and the Chairman said he was encouraged that the present Commission supported the former in this matter.

Exhibit B

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 21/FEB/86-1, Washington Monument Visitors Facility, concept design. The Assistant Secretary observed that consideration of the new master plan for the monument grounds would be among the most important projects ever reviewed by the Commission. He said a number of plans had been considered in the past, beginning with the elaborate proposal by the McMillan Commission, and that recently the feeling had grown that the monument should just be left alone on its hill. He said the Commission had reviewed the Park Service's new master plan from 1981 to 1984 and approved it for conceptual development, although the members had made several comments and recommendations, among them that the parking lot off Constitution Avenue should be removed. There was also some dissatisfaction with the way 15th Street had been severely straightened in the new plan. Two new walks from the Lincoln Memorial/Reflecting Pool area were approved and subsequently constructed. The concept of improving the condition of the plaza around the monument had been approved, as well as further study of ways to improve access to the monument from the Mall across 14th and 15th Streets, now inconvenient and hazardous. The Assistant Secretary said more detailed development of these and other elements of the master plan would be discussed from time to time as they were ready. He noted the hazardous crossings of 14th and 15th streets on a map and pointed out the old stone visitors' center of 1888, now in poor condition and unattractive because of several unsympathetic additions. He said the Commission would see, at this meeting, a proposal for a substantial new visitors' center at 15th Street and Madison Place, and noted that the screening of service vehicles would be a key element in the design of a structure of this type. Before introducing representatives from the

Park Service, he noted that Mr. Porterfield, unable to be present, had sent his comments on the proposals, which would be entered into the record. Mr. Porterfield's principal comments were: (1) There should be no placing of trees around the base of the monument to shade visitors from the sun, because they would detract from its "dynamic form and structure". At the same time he recognized that sun protection was a matter of "public health and safety" and suggested a holding area for visitors away from the base of the monument. (2) The concession stand should be located and designed so as to be less obtrusive, perhaps underground or partially depressed so that the view of it from the street would be minimal. Exhibit C

John Parsons was then introduced to discuss the Park Service's proposals. He showed slides and a film documenting the building of the Washington Monument and the various plans for landscaping the grounds, from Downing's plan of 1851 and the McMillan Plan of 1901, through the 1930's plans of William A. Delano and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. and the plan developed in 1965 by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. He pointed out several elements of the 1965 plan: the large, open circular area around the monument, formed by a heavy planting of large trees in the corners of the grounds; the oblique approach paths from the northeast and southeast corners, the depression of 14th Street and the placement of a visitors center over it. The film documented the way and the direction from which visitors approach the monument and gave some indication of the hazardous street crossings and the number of people who come. Mr. Parsons said the wait to go up in the monument could be as long as two and one-half hours. He noted that 15th Street was used by the Tourmobiles and private cars and taxis dropping people off, as well as normal traffic. The Sylvan Theatre was then pointed out, in the southeast part of the grounds, with Mr. Parsons noting that it was well-used in the summer and would remain in its tree-shrouded location. On another slide Mr. Parsons pointed out a red outlined circle around the monument, saying that this 600 foot radius area was considered the critical area of the grounds.

Upgrading of the plaza at the base of the monument was discussed by landscape architect John Oxner. He said there were two factors to be considered here: the monument as a symbolic piece of sculpture and as a functional building. He said the aim had been to convert the plaza to a more dignified, comfortable place to wait and enjoy the views, and at the same time to respect the sculptural and symbolic aspect of the monument and its axial relationship to the other great monuments of the capital. Mr. Oxner pointed out on drawings an outer promenade connecting the four major paths and offering a viewing area, and closer to the monument, a slightly depressed queueing area, wide enough to accommodate a double row of people (the equivalent of an hour's wait) with benches and shade trees on the north and south quadrants. (The trees were not placed on the east and west because of

possible interference with the axial views along the Mall.) There would also be a waiting area near the elevator entrance.

Mr. Parsons then discussed the food service plans. He said that during the 1976 Bicentennial it was decided that the Mall museums should provide this service, and he noted that there were at present 1200 seats for diners in the Mall area. At the time of the Bicentennial, as there were few food facilities in the Washington Monument/White House/Lincoln Memorial area, a temporary concession building had been constructed on the monument grounds. Located in the southeast section of the grounds, away from the more heavily used northeast entrance, it was not frequently used and also conflicted with the Tourmobiles. Therefore, current plans showed a concession building to the northeast, at 15th Street and Madison Drive. Mr. Parsons introduced architect John Evans to discuss this building. Mr. Evans said the proposed structure would accommodate food service, dining areas, retail, and comfort stations, and noted that as many as 37,000 people pass that point on a summer day. He said the idea of putting the building underground had been explored in 1976 but had been rejected because it tended to look like a burial mound and because visitors would be denied the great views of the Mall. A bermed structure was not satisfactory, either, and so it was decided to put the building above grade. He said it would be a pavilion-type structure with large outdoor dining areas. A large number of trees would be added to the site to screen the facility, and in particular, restocking and servicing hours would be limited and truck entrances would be screened by berming off 15th Street. Mr. Evans said much of the building would be open or glazed and there would be skylights in the roof. Senator Goodman questioned the skylights because of the transmission of heat and glare; Mr. Evans said they were proposed because they would brighten the interior.

The members discussed the various proposals made. The Chairman said he liked the overall master plan landscaping, based on the 1965 SOM plan, because it would repeat on the north the heavily treed area now existing on the south, and because it left a large, soft-edged circular meadow around the monument. He thought the proposed siting of the concessions building imposed on the vistas along both 15th Street and Madison Drive and that the best location would be to the southeast, where the temporary bicentennial structure had been. If that was not feasible then his second choice would be to the north but farther west then planned, where it could be set in a grove of trees. Miss Wolf questioned the need for any structure at all; she thought the most impressive aspect of the monument's setting was the great, empty expanse of green that one sees when looking south on 15th Street. She thought there were ample food facilities in the area and commented on the absence of commercialism in other great park areas, particularly the Tuileries in Paris. Mrs. Regan agreed

that the site proposed for the concession was not a good one, but she said she would not object to a low, "flowing" type of building in the place suggested by the Chairman. She added that she was of the same opinion as Mr. Porterfield in regard to the placing of trees around the base of the monument; she thought they would detract from the purity of its lines. The Chairman said he was concerned about any elements being added there that were out of scale with the verticality of the monument and the horizontality of the Mall; he said this included the "skinny" flag poles. He thought the real beauty of the monument and the site was its minimalism, the way the monument met the earth. He and Mrs. Regan asked if there could be a waiting area separate from the monument; this would give the visitors the experience of approaching the base and seeing the views change. It was agreed by all that the cracked plaza surface and the blighted stone lodge needed change, but that any alterations made should have the least possible impact on the monument. Also, it was stressed again that any building at 15th and Madison Drive would have major visibility and axial problems.

The plans for crossing arrangements at 14th Street were not discussed in detail, but Miss Wolf noted the narrowness of the walks on the west side of the street, finding them inadequate and also confusing because they did not clearly direct the visitor to the monument. She said she had been aware of this on her tour the preceding day, at which time she had also noticed that the proposed overlook on the east side of 14th Street would block the view of the Capitol for those driving along the street.

Mr. Parsons then discussed the possibilities and problems associated with various means of shortening the waiting time at the base of the monument. He said that while ticketing worked well at the White House because of the short (two hour) visiting period, it had been tried over a three to four year period at the monument, which is open all day, and had not been successful; one problem had been tour buses taking large blocks of tickets and then arriving late. The two basic problems they had found were: one, the large number of no-shows; and two, that people generally continued to wait even though their tickets permitted them to come back later. He said this method would be re-examined, however, and his agency would also study the idea, suggested by the members, of providing a holding area in a shady place some distance from the monument. He noted also that a permanent food facility had also been proposed for the Lincoln Memorial area, and he thought this was a good time to re-examine the question of visitor facilities near major monuments if the Commission was going to rule against them in principle. The proposals for the plaza, food facility, and for the treatment of 14th and 15th Streets presented at this meeting were not approved. Exhibit C-1

(Mr. Hart left the meeting after this submission because of illness.)

Before the next submission, the Secretary took the opportunity to introduce two guests from the District government, Valerie Lemmie and Stephen Raiche, both from the Office of Carol Thompson, Director of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

B. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 21/FEB/86-2, renovation of Union Station, First Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N. E., briefing (previous review March 1985). The Secretary noted first, for the benefit of the new members, that the minor changes to the exterior of the building were the only elements of this extensive renovation that required Commission review. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the new members had been given all the previous documents on the renovation and then introduced Keith Kelly, president of the redevelopment corporation, and Paul Childs from the architectural firm of Harry Weese and Associates to give a progress report and discuss details of the exterior renovation, which the Commission had already approved in concept.

Mr. Kelly said the Historic Preservation Law's Section 106 process had been completed, asbestos in the building had been removed, and the removal of the visitors center was underway. He reported that while work was being done, both skylights and murals had been uncovered. He said the 600 foot skylights in the concourse would not be reopened because of leakage problems, but by glazing the monitor on the south side, as much light would enter the space as before when the skylight was open. He said the monitor glazing would not be visible. Mr. Childs showed drawings of proposed detailing for several exterior doors in the arcade; formerly windows, the new doors would provide service to the small outdoor dining areas. Drawings of new doors set into existing grilles, for basement egress into the arcade, were also shown. Mr. Childs said the main entrance would be restored to its original appearance.

The members were all pleased with the sensitivity with which these alterations had been made, and the final drawings were unanimously approved. Mr. Childs also showed preliminary drawings for some changes in the plaza area, consisting of new walks and traffic lights, but these were not complete and were for information only. Exhibit D

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 21/FEB/86-3, Chancery of Canada, final building plans, 501 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. (S.L. 86-65). Staff member Jeffrey Carson introduced Jay Brodie, executive director of PADC, and James Rich, director of development. Slides were shown of the site plan and model and also aerial views of the site and surrounding buildings. Mr. Brodie pointed out the various features of the building and its

relationship to John Marshall Park and the federal court building opposite. The Chairman recalled that the Commission had been enthusiastic about the design and had approved it; the new members, having received the previous documentation and visual material, agreed with this assessment and the final plans were given unanimous approval. Mr. Rich said a design for security gates on Pennsylvania Avenue would be seen later. Exhibit E

(The agenda order was altered at this point and the Evening Star Building presented before the marquee for the Willard Hotel.)

2. CFA 21/FEB/86-7, Evening Star Building, 11th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., renovation and addition, concept design. Mr. Carson introduced Jonathan Woodner, representing the developer, Ian Woodner. Mr. Woodner said the building had been purchased in 1962 and an addition planned since that time. He said the design to be presented at this meeting was different from the one seen by the Commission several years previously, and now that the tenants had left, the project was moving ahead. He said the basic problem with the addition had always been how to add to a beautiful, finely detailed old building without dominating it. He said that in the present design, the addition on Pennsylvania Avenue would wrap around the old building and come through on 11th Street, taking the place of the existing 11th Street annex. He said the new construction on Pennsylvania Avenue would line up with the old building, the only structure between 12th and 7th Streets now at variance with the 50 foot setback on the avenue, and because of this the detailing would be especially important. The second facade of the Pennsylvania Avenue addition would face the plaza of the Presidential Building; there would be an entrance there (which would probably become more important when the Presidential Building is developed) and on Pennsylvania Avenue; the 11th Street entrance would not be emphasized. Mr. Woodner said the original window openings and floors would be kept, even though this meant losing a floor of rentable space.

The architect, David Childs of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, was then introduced to discuss the design. He said the design of the new construction would be abstracted from the old, with the same Palladian organization continued. The 11th Street construction would be higher than that on Pennsylvania Avenue and would have a mansard, tilted back on the 11th Street facade. Windows in the new additions would be flatter in detail than on the old building, and framed in a stone slightly darker than the body of the construction, which in turn would be slightly darker than the marble of the old building. Mr. Childs noted that the Star Building would be cleaned and restored. Miss Wolf had some questions about the fenestration pattern on the 11th Street facade, but in general the members were enthusiastic about the design and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

(Mrs. Regan left the meeting temporarily after this submission).

3. CFA 21/FEB/86-5, Willard Hotel, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., marquee mock-up inspection report (previous review January 1986). Mr. Carson recalled that the Commission had requested a mock-up of the canopy because of uncertainty as to whether it would impair the view of the Capitol from this part of Pennsylvania Avenue. He noted that the Chairman and Miss Wolf had seen the mock-up. Architect Vlastimil Koubek was introduced and admitted that the canopy would obscure the view from certain spots, but not as much as would the proposed street trees; he found both these to be only temporary obstructions, noticed briefly as one walks along the avenue. The Chairman said he thought the canopy was actually an important visual element, tying in with other projections and with the park, and humanizing the Willard; he said it would actually frame the view for those arriving by car. He compared it with the canopy on New York's Plaza Hotel in its festive quality and thought the only spot where the view would really be obscured, momentarily, was from the sidewalk midway between the corner at 15th Street and the hotel entrance. Miss Wolf said the mock-up had been helpful, but she still thought the canopy would be detrimental to L'Enfant's intention to make the Capitol the focal point of every vistas. She thought the feeling of the avenue should be toned down and the Capitol made the focal point. Senator Goodman said he agreed with the position of the Chairman, who noted for the record that the architect of the Capitol, George White, had inspected the canopy mock-up and was not bothered by it; he said Mr. White felt that one couldn't expect to see the Capitol from every spot. Miss Wolf asked if those who had not seen the mock-up could inspect it and then be polled. Senator Goodman thought the inspection would have to be made right after the meeting, so as not to hold up PADC any longer. It was agreed to follow his suggestion.

At the conclusion of the meeting the Chairman, Mrs. Regan, Miss Wolf, and Senator Goodman inspected the mock-up at the site. Mrs. Regan and Senator Goodman voted in favor of the canopy, while Miss Wolf reaffirmed her disapproval. The Chairman did not vote, but said he also favored approval. Thus the project was approved by a split decision. Exhibit G

(Note is also made for the record that Mr. Hart was polled at home later in the day and said he was opposed. Mrs. Deaver was in favor when polled on Monday, 24 February, and Mr. Porterfield was opposed when he visited the site later in the week.)

4. CFA 21/FEB/86-8, Washington Hotel, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., sidewalk cafe design. Mr. Carson pointed out the location for this cafe, at the corner of 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, adjacent to the hotel. He introduced Vincent Lepardo from

Hughes Design Associates, who showed drawings of decorative wrought-iron partitions which would be used to define the area; he also pointed out the location of a broad-striped beige and brown awning over an areaway to screen the food service and cashier area, and showed a photograph of the beige European-type umbrellas to be used over dining tables. He said the cafe elements would be removed in the winter months. Mr. Lepardo also showed photographs of fiberglass planters with a brownish, sand finish. The members asked to see a sample planter before approving the finish, but otherwise unanimously approved the other materials and the design. Exhibit H

D. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

CFA 21/FEB/86-4, Arlington Cemetery, Visitors Center Parking Garage, revised concept design, and inspection report (Previous review, January 1986). The Assistant Secretary showed a model, located the project on a map, and reviewed the previous submissions and actions. He said the parking structure design had now been modified so that it was set farther back from Jefferson Drive and also lower into the ground. He introduced architect Donald Lethbridge to continue the discussion.

Mr. Lethbridge said he had tried to make the parking garage a handsome structure and as little visible as possible. He said he thought the changes made since the last meeting had been beneficial to the design. He pointed out on drawings that the entire structure had been lowered 5 feet and moved back, so that the minimum distance from Jefferson Drive was now 85 feet. He noted that the boundary wall of the cemetery would be reconstructed and used as a retaining wall, with berming behind it to give a higher base for planting. In answer to a question from Senator Goodman, he said the buses would not be seen because the bus area had been made smaller and the planting area increased so that full size trees could be planted; parked cars would not be seen, either. Mr. Lethbridge said the granite face of the planters would be glimpsed occasionally from the road because he did not think it desirable, from an aesthetic point of view, to plant a sold screen of trees the entire length of the structure. Miss Wolf asked what would be seen from across the river. Mr. Lethbridge said nothing would be visible because the various plantings in between would form layers and obscure the view.

Mr. Lethbridge then discussed the lighting, an aspect of the design that had troubled the members previously. He said there would be low lights along the walks, and inside all lighting would be set up into the structure or screened. The lowest level consistent with safety would be used: probably 1 foot lambert per square foot, or 2-3 footcandles. Miss Wolf asked if the lights in the vault of the visitors center would be visible at night when turned on for cleaning purposes. Mr. Lethbridge said there would be no direct light onto

the vault, which would be made of grey glass, and he did not think it would be visible but he would check.

The members were pleased with the revisions made and gave the concept design unanimous approval. Exhibit I

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 86-76, 3300 M Street, N. W., new office/retail building (previous 13 November 1985, O.G. 86-280). The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had asked for further development of some of the details of this building; he said the Georgetown Board had seen it since, thought it met the Commission's recommendations, and was recommending that it go ahead. He added that the Board's recommendation was based on further discussion of the brick color and color scheme. Mr. Kvell, the architect, then discussed his response to the previous recommendations. He said he had been asked to study possible ornamental detailing and rethink the design of a large window opening on 33rd Street whose elements seemed to lack any structural support. In regard to the latter, he said the columns had been made more three dimensional, with bases and small capitals--thus adding to the decorative quality as well as giving the impression of support--and the brick wall above had been corbelled back to the beam, giving a more tangible sense of structure. He said use of a darker color to outline structural elements would also help. He noted the addition of decorative iron grilles on the basement windows and said that the confusion between window and door openings, placed on either side of the 33rd Street stair window, had been solved by using a grille on the window and leaving the door plain. Senator Goodman asked about safety precautions for the exterior basement stair at the corner. Mr. Kvell said it would be protected with an iron railing, similar in design to the basement window grilles.

The Chairman asked if there were any representatives present from the community. Isabel Shannon, an ANC representative, said she had received no comments and had not previously seen the design, although the chairman of the Georgetown ANC, William Cochran, was familiar with it.

The members agreed with the Georgetown Board that the project should go ahead, especially as there were no objections from the community, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit J

b. O.G. 86-70-71, 1625 and 1627 34th Street, N. W., renovation and additions (previous case, O.G. 85-100). The Assistant Secretary paraphrased the Georgetown Board's report to the Commission on these houses, saying that they had been built ca. 1845, and between 1855 and 1875 altered by raising the front facade and most likely changing the roof line as well. He said the Board had reviewed the project several times and had gone through a number of design changes with the applicant, the aim being to keep the existing format of the houses, the front and side elevations, their siding, and at least part of the roof line. It was also requested that the slot between 1627 and its neighbor to the north be kept open and the additions confined to the rear. The Chairman asked about the character of the space behind the houses in that block and was told by the Secretary that it was continuous green space, with no alley and therefore no garages. He said numerous letters had been received from the neighbors who were desirous of keeping as much of this garden character as possible. Miss Wolf said she had not realized the extent of the green space and wondered if the Georgetown Board had considered it. The Secretary said they had certainly considered the mass of the additions and how far they penetrated the open space. The Chairman noted that the Board's report had not mentioned this and thought perhaps the project could be remanded to them and they could be requested to make a site inspection.

The Assistant Secretary then introduced the architect, Dudley Cannada, to discuss his proposal. He said he thought it had been well summarized by the Assistant Secretary, but wanted to add that the houses were very small and the lots narrow, and that the additions as proposed would make the difference between two and three bedroom houses; he said the lot coverage would average a little more than 50%, pointing out that the addition on the northern house extended farther than the one on the south. (The Secretary explained that the reason for this was that it was a tradeoff for keeping the narrow side yard open.) He noted that other houses in the square extended back even further. The Chairman thought the great expanse of green in the rear would mitigate the impact of these additions; he also pointed out how little the proposed alteration could be seen from public space. It was unanimously agreed that the Georgetown Board should take another look at the larger of the two additions and make a site inspection; it was agreed that approval could be granted to the smaller addition and that the decision on the other could be made by the Georgetown Board and would not have to be returned to the Commission.

The Assistant Secretary noted that there were representatives present from the community. Mrs. Westie McDermid spoke for the neighbors, saying that while they had no objection to some additions being made and would welcome the restoration of the houses, the

feeling was that the current proposal was too massive in relation to the original houses and to others on the block. She showed photographs of the back yards, noting what she termed the "environmental and aesthetic" rear line of construction which the neighbors thought should be maintained.

The Chairman thanked her for her comments and repeated the Commission's decision to approve the smaller addition on 1625 34th Street and remand the larger, at 1627, to the Georgetown Board. Exhibit J

c. O.G. 86-47, 1222 28th Street, N. W., one story rear additon (previous case, O.G. 85-100). The Assistant Secretary referred to the report in the members' folders made by the Georgetown Board on this project in which the Board recommended approval. He said the small frame house was one of the oldest in Georgetown, dating from the late 18th century, that it had apparently had a frame addition in the rear in the late 19th century, since removed, and that the oversize dormer in the rear was added in the 1940's. He noted that the addition now proposed would not be visible from public space when the gate to the side yard was raised one foot, as intended, and that it had received approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals and the ANC. He said it was being brought to the attention of the Commission because it was unique and one of the oldest houses in the area, not because there had been any problems with the proposal. The members had no objection to the addition and approved it unanimously. Exhibit J

d. Appendix I, review of Old Georgetown Board recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 86-67, 702-720 5th Street, N. W., new building for Group Health Association, concept design. Mr. Carson located this site, at the northwest corner of Judiciary Square, and showed photographs of a four story Victorian building on the corner of 5th and G Streets, noting that the new five-story structure to be reviewed would be next to it and would run north to a wide, mid-block alley (G Place). The architect, David Buckley of SBA/Steffian Bradley Associates, Boston, was introduced to discuss his design. Mr. Buckley said he was requesting only concept approval at this time and showed drawings and a model of his project, pointing out on photographs two small buildings that would be demolished. He said he had tried to respond in general to the historic character of the neighborhood and to the adjacent historic building in particular by using 25 foot bays, a stone or precast base, and brick for the main part of the structure. He said the ANC had expressed approval of the design thus far, and Mr. Carson read a letter from the Wilkes Company, who plan to construct a building on the north side of the alley, praising the design

and noting only that they hoped the loading dock and parking entrance doors on the alley, facing their building, would be kept closed. The Chairman asked about the two buildings to be demolished and was told by the Secretary that they were of no architectural or historic importance. Miss Wolf was critical of the window spacing near the main entrance, and Mr. Buckley said he would restudy it with her comments in mind. Otherwise, the members were pleased with the concept design and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit J

b. S.L. 86-72, 3007 Oregon Knolls Drive, N. W., new house. Mr. Carson recalled the review of several houses here, noting that it was an ongoing project. He said this submission was for a larger frame house, similar to the "Victorian" farm house type seen before. He said the rear of the house would face the park, and the balconies shown on the drawings had been deleted. He introduced the developer, Steven Flanagan, who described the house and said, in regard to the balconies, that they would actually be optional, and he said he had another elevation in which the doors to the balconies would be replaced by windows. The Chairman asked for the staff's comments; Mr. Carson said the main concern was the appearance of the balconies, which were to be made of pressure-treated lumber with a rough quality not consistent with the house, and unattractive when viewed from below. The Chairman thought this problem could be worked out between Mr. Flanagan and the staff; the other members agreed, and as there were no other objections, the final decision was delegated. Mr. Carson made the last comment, saying that Robert Jeffers, the head of the neighborhood association who had been highly critical of some of the earlier houses, had seen the plans for this house and had no registered no objections. Exhibit J

c. S.L. 86-76, 441 4th Street, N. W., revised concept designs for new office building (previous review, January 1986, S.L. 86-60). (Mrs. Regan returned to the meeting at this point). The Assistant Secretary recalled that this was the third submission for this project. He said the architect, Vlastimil Koubek, had prepared an entirely new design and introduced him to discuss it.

Mr. Koubek showed a number of slides, beginning with a view of the model prepared for the Judiciary Square master plan. He reviewed the requirements for setbacks, from the square and on the buildings themselves, and for new construction to be conceived as a frame for the historic buildings, and that it must be of a limestone color with bronze-toned windows. He then showed slides of buildings in the area, new and old, including his own office building on the west side of the square, directly opposite the site for this project. He showed views of his first two designs for the project and then drawings and a model of the new design, which had a decidedly horizontal feeling in contrast to the more pronounced verticality of the earlier schemes.

The copper mansard-type roof forms had been eliminated. There were continuous bands of light stone and bronze-tinted glass wrapped around the building, in contrast to the framing effect seen in his building across the square. The glass would be set back from the facade about 20" and would be butt-jointed at the corners, increasing the effect of horizontality. There was a glazed, trellised canopy on 4th Street, 150 feet long and 35 feet deep, sheltering the entrance and the subway escalators. The main entrance, mostly glass, opened into a lobby with a two-story mural. The drawings showed a large planting area balancing the escalators on the other side of the building entrance; this entrance plaza was at the same grade as the landscaped 40 foot setback area, making one continuous space, as requested previously by Mr. Porterfield. The base of the building had been extended slightly forming a raised podium at the sides and the rear as the grade dropped; there was a planting area around the edge of this podium. Mr. Koubek pointed out a granite base and said the body of the building would be limestone-colored precast and the windows bronze glass. In answer to a question from Miss Wolf, he said the glass on the canopy would be treated to reflect heat. Senator Goodman asked who had set the criteria for the design of new buildings on the square; Mr. Koubek said it was done by the District of Columbia government and the National Capital Planning Commission, with approval by the Commission of Fine Arts. Senator Goodman then asked why this design was different from the first two, and Mr. Koubek said that when he re-read the requirements he realized that his earlier designs did not conform. His attempt was to continue the urban design concept of balancing the buildings on either side of the central north-south axis, completing the frame for the historic, smaller buildings in the middle. Also, he had tried to make a feature of the subway escalators, as requested by the Commission, rather than considering them an afterthought, unrelated to the building. The glass entrance, making the two-story lighted mural visible from the street, had also been in response to Mr. Hart's request to incorporate art and to make it integral to the building. Miss Wolf asked questions about the fenestration in comparison with a new building further north on 4th Street and with Mr. Koubek's building on the other side of the square; she also asked what the distance would be between his two buildings and was told it would be about two city blocks.

The Chairman said he thought it was time to come to a decision. The developer, Peter Schwartz, was present and asked to report that the design had been submitted to the ANC and had received their approval. Mrs. Regan said she liked the new design and thought it related well to the other buildings on the square. A vote was taken and the project was approved, with Miss Wolf casting a dissenting vote. Exhibit J

d. S.L. 86-75, 698 Water Street, S. W., new restaurant building, Southwest Waterfront, final plans (previous review, September 1982). Mr. Carson recalled that the Commission had approved the concept drawings for this project and showed the members a rendering. He also pointed out the location, on the Washington Channel below Maine Avenue, near the Phillips Flagship restaurant recently reviewed. He compared the concept and final drawings, noting the Victorian character of both and in the final version, the addition of a tower with rounded corners and minor changes to the roofline and silhouette; basically, he said, it was very much like what had already been approved. He introduced the architect, Gregory Uekman from the Kerns Group, who said he had nothing to add but would be happy to answer any questions. The Secretary said the staff had gone over the drawings carefully and they conformed to what had been approved, with the exceptions already pointed out. Miss Wolf asked about signs, and the Secretary said that if they were proposed, they would have to be submitted separately. There were no other questions and the final plans were unanimously approved. Exhibit J

e. S.L. 86-62, 2121 Park Road, N. W., new indoor swimming pool, concept design. Mr. Carson showed a site plan of the property, noting the proposed location for the swimming pool building, and recalled the Commission's previous review of a garage and parking area for the property. He introduced David Steinbraker, representing the applicant. Mr. Steinbraker said the brick building would be T-shaped, and in addition to the pool would contain dressing rooms and a family room. He showed an elevation drawing of a Georgian-style structure, similar to the main house, with round-headed French door units. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Carson said the pool building would be virtually invisible from public space. The members were pleased with the design and approved it unanimously. Exhibit J

f. Appendix II. Review of staff recommendations. There were no objections and the recommendations were approved.

F. National Academy of Sciences

CFA 21/FEB/86-9, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W., final plans for walkway to Einstein Memorial Statue area (previous review, October 1885). Mrs. Kohler recalled that the concept for this alteration had been approved previously and detailed drawings and a material sample requested. She said a new entrance was needed to the statue area because of greatly increased visitation after the opening of the Vietnam memorial; instead of using the circuitous route through the grounds to the statue, visitors were climbing over the Constitution Avenue retaining wall and then jumping off as they left. She showed drawings for the construction of the steps and a site plan for the

walkway; the walk would be concrete and the steps marble. The marble would come from a stockpile kept after the construction of the building and so would match the wall exactly; she showed a sample. There were no objections to the drawings or the material sample, and the final plans were unanimously approved. Exhibit K

G. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

CFA 21/FEB/86-10, Army Civilian Award for Humanitarian Service, design. Mrs. Kohler explained to the new members that the Commission reviewed these awards from time to time and that they were designed by the artists at the Institute of Heraldry with the appropriate heraldic devices and symbolism in mind. She showed drawings for the obverse, depicting two hands holding laurel branches, and for the reverse, which gave the name of the award at the top with space for the recipient's name below. There were no objections to the reverse but there was unanimous agreement that the rendition of the hands was poorly done and not acceptable. The Chairman suggested that the staff work with the Institute of Heraldry in an effort to produce a better design. Exhibit L

H. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 21/FEB/86-6, Lady Bird Johnson Medal, resubmission of obverse (previous review, December 1985). Mrs. Kohler recalled the request in December for a fresh start on this portrait, and then introduced Francis Frere and George Schaffer from the Mint to show the Commission two new clay models. Mr. Frere said one was a revised version by the artist John Mercanti who had done the original; the other was by artist Sheryl Winter. The members were not enthusiastic about either one, but preferred Mr. Winter's design. The Chairman suggested, and the others agreed,that the Commission would approve the Winter design if it was acceptable to Mrs. Johnson.

Mr. Schaffer then reported that progress had been made on selecting a wildflower to use for the design of the reverse of the medal. He showed drawings and photographs of the bluebonnet and Indian paint brush, both Texas flowers. The Commission had seen a design based on the bluebonnet before but thought it too stiff and tree-like; Miss Wolf thought the Indian paint brush would present the same problems. Mrs. Kohler noted also that it was the state flower of Wyoming. The drawing of the bluebonnet was more graceful and flower-like than the earlier version, and it was suggested that the Mint work from this. Mr. Frere said that as Mrs. Johnson had expressed an interest in using the Indian paint brush, they would prepare designs using both flowers and show them to the Commission. Exhibit M

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

2219 California Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008
(202) 797-8290

EXHIBIT A

February 3,1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman, members and staff, U.S. Commission of Fine Arts

SUBJECT: Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution :
Proposal for discussion

We recently received from the Bicentennial Commission an outline of their program and proposals for the celebration of the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. Among the suggestions for possible commemorative activities was the commissioning of works of public art (page 17, section 140, First Report of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution, 17,Sept.1985)

I wish to offer for consideration by the members of the Fine Arts Commission a recommendation to the Bicentennial Commission for a series of commemorative works of art.

The FBI building on Pennsylvania has long confounded attempts to "Humanize" this structure, especially the Pennsylvania Ave. ground floor side with its massive,flat concrete panels on the pedestrian level. Attempts have been made, unsuccessfully, to allow retail shops which could give color and vitality to the block. The FBI, for security reasons, is firmly opposed to this.

I propose that the commission recommend that these large panel areas, which presently add heavily to the oppressiveness of the building be permanently adorned with sculpture panels. This would add interest and visual variety to the facade at pedestrian level, and could serve as a major thematic,or iconic focus at this portion of the avenue.

The Justice Department is most certainly a singularly appropriate site for works of sculpture thematically based on the constitution and created on the occassion of its Bicentennial. This is rich, visual subject matter encompassing a broad range of important areas of American history such as civil rights, womens suffrage, etc.

I propose that we recommend this concept to the Bicentennial commission for their consideration, with copies sent to the appropriate parties involved; the Attorney General, the FBI, PADC and so forth. If the Bicentennial Commission supports and endorses the concept, funding would seem easy to accomplish, considering the national significance of the commemoration.

FREDERICK E. HART

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-1

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Chief Justice:

Since our last report to you following the Commission's January meeting, a proposal was made by our sculptor member Frederick E. Hart which we would like to add to our list of projects for the Constitution Bicentennial Commission's program. It is the commemoration of milestones in the history of the Constitution through the placement of sculptured panels on the FBI Building.

As all of us know, the ground floor wall panels of the FBI facing on Pennsylvania Avenue are not a pretty sight. For years, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and others have been exploring ways in which the appearance of the walls could be improved, but until now none of the ideas (including installation of shops, show windows or display cases) has gained acceptance. There is always the possibility that display cases would look tacked-on and temporary.

By contrast, the proposed sculpture would have a permanence and enduring quality that is especially suitable to a federal building. It will also add to an already established tradition of sculptural decoration of buildings that is one of the hallmarks of The Federal Triangle immediately across the Avenue. For these reasons the Commission believes this proposal would be a most suitable undertaking as an official Constitution Bicentennial Commission event.

Since adopting this resolution at the Commission's 21 February meeting, the staff has been in touch with a number of people in the FBI, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and the National Endowment for the Arts, and so far the reaction to the idea has been very positive. It was agreed that holding a competition for the design would be a way of involving sculptors in a program of national significance. There are very few such competitions, especially for

sculptors, and the celebration of the Constitution would be a most fitting occasion to involve the best of our American artists.

Because of the constitutional theme, the Department of Justice and the Attorney General probably should spearhead the efforts to push this proposal forward. The Commission and its staff, however, will be happy to give whatever assistance is possible. We have no funds, but we can certainly help things along in other ways.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Chief Justice Warren Burger
Chairman
Constitution Bicentennial Commission
734 Jackson Place, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-2

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

I thought you should have copies of our letters to Judge Webster, Chief Justice Burger, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation chairman regarding the proposal to install sculptured panels on the walls of the FBI Building. As you will see, the idea would be to develop a suitable memorial to the development of the Constitution as an official event of the Bicentennial program, and at the same time improve the appearance of the FBI Headquarters Building. It would also involve the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and eventually the Congress for the purpose of authorizing specific funds.

I hope you agree that the idea has some merit.

While we will be following everyone's reaction to the proposal, it will have to be initiated by one of the prime agencies involved, such as your department or the Bureau, since the Commission of Fine Arts has only advisory powers. In the meantime, however, we will be happy to answer any questions you might have and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

enclosures

The Honorable
Edwin Meese III
U. S. Attorney General
U. S. Department of Justice
10th & Constitution Avenue, N. W.
Room 510
Washington, D. C. 20530

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-3

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Judge Webster:

You may have already read of a proposal made at our 21 February Commission meeting involving the placement of sculptured panels on the FBI Building that would tie into the forthcoming Bicentennial of the Constitution. We think the idea has some merit and hope you will agree.

For some time, as you know, a number of projects have been suggested that were aimed at relieving the severity of the ground floor wall panels on the headquarters building, especially where it faces Pennsylvania Avenue. Most of these proposals either had commercial overtones, would look too temporary or were otherwise unsuitable for a federal building. The placement of sculptured reliefs within these blank panels would on the other hand give a real lift to the appearance of the facade, at the same time marking in a relevant way important points in the history of the evolution of the Constitution, a most appropriate expression for the principal agencies charged with protecting it and enforcing our laws.

I understand there have been discussions with PADC officials exploring ways in which various displays mounted by the Smithsonian could be installed on the walls. However, I hope you will give the Commission's proposal a serious look. It has a certain dignity that none of the other proposals so far has had, and a theme that fits particularly well with the work of both the Bureau and the Justice Department.

We have also written Chief Justice Burger, Chairman of the Constitution Bicentennial Commission, as well as the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation; copies of these letters are enclosed for your information.

The Commission, of course, is an advisory agency and does not have the means to put proposals such as this into effect, nor would it be appropriate, since at some point we

would have to render an opinion on the actual sculpture, were it to go forward. However, we are happy to supply whatever assistance we can at staff level, either on technical matters or on questions involving the design process.

We see this project not only accomplishing the points we have already touched upon, but also presenting a wonderful opportunity to involve American artists in a significant program celebrating the Constitution. I hope it is something we can all support and I look forward to hearing from you.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

enclosures

The Honorable
William H. Webster
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigations
J. Edgar Hoover Building
9th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Room 7176
Washington, D. C. 20535

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A-4

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Berliner:

At the Commission's meeting on February 21, 1986, a proposal was adopted to place sculptured panels on the walls of the FBI Building as part of the Constitution Bicentennial Commemoration. Introduced by our sculptor member, Frederick E. Hart, the panels would celebrate milestones in the history of the Constitution. The panels would also serve to help another longstanding problem and that is to remedy the harsh appearance of the blank walls on the Pennsylvania Avenue side of the FBI Building.

I know that you have always taken a personal interest in finding some solution to this problem, and that currently studies are underway with the Smithsonian about the possibility of installing display cases that would contain changing exhibits. While this may have merit, we would urge that consideration be given to our proposal as well. We feel the permanence of sculptured panels would be an appropriate way to enliven the architecture and perhaps avoid the temporary look and continuing administrative problems that changing exhibits could bring. I am enclosing copies of Mr. Hart's memo on this proposal and our letters to Judge Webster of the FBI and Attorney General Meese. I would think that the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI would be the prime movers with PADC in this endeavor.

The National Endowment for the Arts might also play a role, especially if in the initial stages of study a competition were to be held for the design. Of course, the Commission and its staff will be happy to lend any support that it can. We look forward to hearing from you.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

enclosures

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT B

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE DESIGN OF TECHWORLD ADOPTED AT THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS ON FEBRUARY 21, 1986

Whereas, the Fine Arts Commission was created to advise upon the merit of art, architecture and planning in the nation's capital and, in particular, to oversee and safeguard the integrity of the L'Enfant plan, and

Whereas, the commission responded to a request from the District of Columbia Zoning Commission to review the proposed design for the development project located between Seventh and Ninth Streets, Northwest and "I" and "K" Streets, Northwest, known as Techworld, and has found serious fault with a number of aspects of the design. The bulk and height of the buildings are severely out of scale and out of character with the historic area within which it is to be located. Of greatest concern to the commission is the violation of the authority of the original L'Enfant plan, by the massive construction which spans and destroys the Eighth Street vista between two landmark buildings.

This commission was principally created for the precise purpose of insuring that the genius of L'Enfant's vision for a great world capital would be inviolate.

Therefore: it is unanimously resolved that the commission condemns the proposed design for the project known as Techworld and directs the secretary to transmit this resolution to the appropriate authorities.

EXHIBIT C

TO: The Commission of Fine Arts, 708 Jackson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20006

FROM: Neil Porterfield

DATE: February 17, 1986

REF: WASHINGTON MONUMENT GROUNDS PARK SERVICE MASTER PLAN

ATTN: Mr. Charles Atherton, Secretary

It would be presumptuous of me to comment in detail without hearing directly from the authors of this plan. However, I will offer the following general comments:

1. I agree with the CFA staff that the proposed trees at the base of the monument will detract from the dynamic form and structure of the monument. And, I oppose this particular solution to the practical problem of providing a shaded, comfortable environment for those who are waiting in line.

   However, I am in great sympathy for a need to consider the comfort--indeed the physical well-being of the small children and older visitors who must queue-up under Washington's oppressive summer sun. This is more than a "creative comfort" issue; it is really one of public health and safety.

   I believe the NPS should re-study this problem. Would it be possible, for example, to have a "holding area" for those waiting somewhere other than at the base of the monument?

2. I agree with the staff's appraisal of this concession stand. It should be designed and located to be less obtrusive. It should be a "non-building"--perhaps it could be underground or at least partially depressed (1/2 level) so that from the monument side the landscaping would cover it and from the streetside the silhouette would be minimal.

I regret that I will miss this month's meeting, but the conflict is unavoidable.

NHP/kjr

Neil Porterfield

Feb mtg. folder

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

FEB 18 1986

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C-1

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Jack:

The Commission reviewed the National Park Service proposals for the Washington Monument Grounds during its 21 February 1986 meeting and found that the submission falls far short of the design goals required for the site. To avoid any misunderstanding, the Commission would like to address these proposals individually.

There is no question that the simple man-made geometry of the Washington Monument is the central theme. All else is peripheral. We also reaffirm that the master plan for trees defining the space around the monument in a large circular open space or meadow is still a valid concept. Keeping this in mind, the Commission believes that the following observations should be carefully considered in revising the current proposal:

(1) The visitors facility as proposed is totally unacceptable with respect to its location and size. Placing the structure in a position that clearly interrupts the visual and axial lines of both 15th Street and Madison Drive not only gives it a false sense of importance but effectively competes with the Monument itself for attention. As to size, it should be pointed out that the entire structure from end to end is nearly 280' long, more than half the height of the Monument itself. The program that has led to such an extensive structure needs serious reexamination.

(2) The present pedestrian access to the Monument from the east is both unsafe and inappropriate. Rather than concentrating on erecting a barrier overlook at the west end of the Mall parallel to 14th Street, which might incidentally affect motorists' view of the Capitol, it would seem that wider walkways west of 14th Street could pick up the line of Madison and Jefferson Drives for a better approach.

(3) The Commission has gone on record acknowledging the need to realign 15th Street. Straightening the street was not necessarily what the Commission had in mind, however. Such a resolution denies the natural contours of the hill. As conceived and implemented over the years, the Grounds provide a natural, rather than geometric, setting. Retaining a curve to the street would complement and reinforce that fact.

(4) The concept of the proposed plaza design with its raised planters and trees next to the base of the Monument is also unacceptable. It would seriously alter the character of the Monument by taking away from the simple drama and dignity of the obelisk and the uncluttered ground upon which it rests.

(5) The Commission understands that the Park Service once before tried to resolve the problem of long waiting lines during the summer heat through the implementation of a ticketing system similar to the one for the White House. While we recognize there were problems, it still is not clear why a shaded holding area and a first-come first-served program, pulling visitors up to the monument at a rate it could absorb could not be worked out. A pleasant waiting area in conjunction with the visitor facility could be established. A discreet system of sign/maps could direct those members of the public wishing to tour the Monument to the visitor facility and waiting area.

(6) Though the presentation at our meeting indicated studies showing prime access to the Monument from the northeast, we note that the least conspicuous area for buses and tourmobiles is the southeast quadrant of the Grounds and that this is also more convenient to the subway as well as several major museums and points of interest. It should not be overlooked that buses already use that area for waiting, precisely because it is not busy and has access to existing public rest rooms. As stated earlier, the circumstance the Commission has found particularly disturbing is that adequate pedestrian connections between these points are just about nil. Therefore, it would seem that careful reconsideration should be given to the southeast corner of the grounds as a principal entrance for the visitor and the logical location for public conveniences.

This is one of the more important projects that the National Park Service will undertake. It will demand the most careful design solution to embrace both the practical and formal civic design issues that have been problems for a long time. In the long run, the final solution must clearly support the fact that the Monument is the primary symbol of the Capital, and nothing should be done that would diminish its unique presence.

We look forward to working with you in achieving this end.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. J. Manus Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W., Room 336
Washington, D. C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT D

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Kelly:

It was a pleasure to meet with you and Mr. Childs at our 21 February 1986 meeting and to continue our approval and support for the exterior renovation planned for Union Station. We look forward to discussing future proposals for lighting, signs, and landscaping as those plans progress. Though there is no objection to the concept of a revised pedestrian connection across the plaza, we anticipate that the matter is one which the National Park Service will bring to us after further coordination with you. Under the present submission, the Commission approves plans to reopen the monitor on the concourse roof to natural light. However, in approving the new openings within the arcade areas, our only caution is that new materials match the existing as closely as possible and that new glazing have the same transparency and color as the original for consistent nighttime illumination.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Keith Kelly, President
Union Station Redevelopment
Corporation
444 North Capitol Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

At its meeting of 21 February 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with you and Mr. Rich for a briefing on the proposed Chancery of Canada building at 501 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest. The members note that the working drawings received 3 February 1986 comply with the preliminary design approved at the meeting held 12 December 1984 and look forward to reviewing designs for the gate and fence when ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT F

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

At its meeting of 21 February 1986, the Commission along with John Woodner, the developer, and David Childs of SOM, the architect, reviewed a concept design for additions to the Evening Star Building at 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest. The members were unanimous in commending the project and look forward to seeing the results of its development and material selection. The Commission notes that with design development, opportunity will arise to refine certain details especially the new principal entrance facing the Avenue which at present seems a bit over scaled.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT G

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

This will confirm the Commission's approval on 21 February 1986 of the design for the new entrance marquee on the Pennsylvania Avenue facade of the Willard Hotel. The mock-up, which was constructed at our request, was very helpful in assessing the effect the marquee would have on the view along the Pennsylvania Avenue sidewalk. From the corner at Fifteenth Street, the top of the canopy appeared to be well below the drum of the Capitol dome which is one view with which we were especially concerned. The Treasury Building would also be higher than the Willard so that the view of it is unaffected. We appreciate the cooperation of the Carr Company and their architect, Mr. Koubek, in arranging for the construction of the mock-up, and for leaving it in place for several days so our members could see it.

In taking this action, the Commission would like to underline its continuing concern for maintaining an unobstructed view along the Pennsylvania Avenue sidewalk. We feel the Willard is a unique situation, noting that an entrance canopy was a familiar feature of the historic facade for many years. It should not be construed, however, that entrance marquees, canopies, flags or banners would be favorably viewed on other locations on the Avenue, especially where the old building line exists and the sidewalk is considerably more narrow.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Brodie:

At its meeting of 21 February 1986, the Commission was pleased to meet with you and Vince LoPardo of Hughes Design to discuss the proposed new sidewalk cafe at the corner of 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest. Because the realignment of the Avenue created a difficult leftover space adjacent to the Washington Hotel, the members agreed that an open cafe would improve the site. The designs for the individual elements of the project also met with general approval, the possible exception being the intended material of the movable planters.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. M. J. Brodie
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT I

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved a revised preliminary design for the Arlington Cemetery Visitor Center Parking Garage during its 21 February 1986 meeting. The response to our recommendations for making the structure less visible was commendable. The Commission noted that by pushing the complex back from the highway and five feet deeper into the ground, a more agreeable design solution was achieved. Obviously, the choice of paving materials and the intensity of lighting will need to be discreet as we have already mentioned. The Commission looks forward to reviewing the working drawings and a coordinated landscape plan for the general planting screen, berming and eastern boundary wall when ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering
and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314-1000

OLD GEORGETOWN AND SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACTIONS

Re: Items of the February 21, 1986 Meeting Agenda

EXHIBIT J

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 86-76 HPA. 86-229	3300 M Street, N. W. Limited Partnership	New building: Conceptual

ACTION: Concept is approved for design development. Request submission of final design drawings and samples of materials for review prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 86-70 HPA. 86-225	1625 34th Street, N. W. Thirty-fourth Street Associates	Renovation and addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for renovation and addition to existing house at 1625 34th Street shown as one of two houses on drawings received and dated February 6, 1986. Note attached supplemental sheets dated February 6, 1986.

O.G. 86-71 HPA. 86-226	1627 34th Street, N. W. Thirty-fourth Street Associates	Renovation and addition

ACTION: Superseded by O.G. case 86-96.

O.G. 86-47 HPA. 86-158 (See O.G. 86-100)	1222 28th Street, N. W. Ann Caracristi	One story addition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for one-story addition as shown on drawing received and dated 9 January 1986. Drawing conforms to approved concept design. (See O.G. 86-100).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-65 HPA. 86-195	501 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	

ACTION: No objection to the design as submitted and received 3 February 1986 and approved during public session 21 February 1986.

S.L. 86-67	702-720 5th Street, N. W. Group Health Association	New medical building

ACTION: No objection to the design concept for the proposed new medical building as shown on drawings received and dated 3 February 1986. Request final working drawings and material samples be submitted for approval of Commission prior to issuance of permit.

S.L. 86-72	3007 Oregon Knolls Drive, N. W. Tidelands Construction, Inc.	New house

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new residence as shown on drawings received and dated 19 February 1986.

S.L. 86-76 HPA. 86-233	441 4th Street, N. W. Peter N. G. Schwartz	New office building

ACTION: Concept for design of new office building is approved. Request submission of working drawings and material samples for approval of CFA prior to permit issuance. (See letter to Carol Thompson dated 4 March 1986.)

S.L. 86-75	698 Water Street, S. W. Specialty Restaurant, Inc.	New restaurant

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new restaurant building as shown on working drawings received and dated 19 February 1986. Request separate applications for lighting, signs and awnings.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 86-62	2121 Park Road, Northwest Senator and Mrs. J. D. Rockefeller, IV	Indoor pool: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the design concept for the proposed indoor swimming pool as shown on drawings received and dated 24 January 1986. Request working drawings received and dated 24 January 1986. Request working drawings be submitted for approval prior to issuance of permit.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT K

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mr. Darrow:

At its meeting on 21 February 1986 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed final plans for steps and a walkway to the Einstein memorial on the Academy's grounds; a marble sample for the steps was also seen.

We understand the National Park Service has no objection to these alterations, and we are happy to tell you that the Commission of Fine Arts gave unanimous approval to both the plans and the material sample.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Wilson L. Darrow
Director
Office of Facilities and Services
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20418

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT L

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Colonel Luchino:

At its meeting on 21 February 1986 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Department of the Army Civilian Award for Humanitarian Service.

There were no objections to the reverse of this medal, or to the concept of the obverse, but the members were not happy with the rendering of the hands and the way in which they held the laurel.

It was suggested that a representative from the Institute confer with the staff on an acceptable modification to the design.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

enclosure

Gerald T. Luchino
Colonel, General Staff
Director, Support Operations Division
The Institute of Heraldry
Department of the Army
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-5050

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT M

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 13, 1986

Dear Mrs. Pope:

At its meeting on 21 February 1986 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed two plaster models for the obverse of the Lady Bird Johnson medal. While the members did not think either one was a particularly good likeness of Mrs. Johnson, they preferred the one by artist Sheryl Winter.

The Commission would be willing to give its approval to this design if it is acceptable to Mrs. Johnson.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U. S. Mint
Washington, D. C. 20220

MEETING:

17 April 1986